DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 436 SO 013 510

AUTHOR Burr, Julie
TITLE Fundraising Strategies for Community Organizations to Support Major Activities: A Case Study of Southeast Effective Development (S.E.E.D.).
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Libraries, Wash.: Seattle Univ., Wash. Inst. of Public Service.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Library Research and Demonstration Branch.
PUB DATE 79
GRANT G007900538
NOTE 33p.: For a related document, see SO 013 511-512. Appendix II contains small print and may not reproduce well from EDRS in microfiche or paper copy.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies: Citizen Participation: *Community Action: *Community Development: Community Resources: Financial Needs: Financial Support: *Fund Raising: Grantsmanship: Program Proposals: Proposal Writing: Public Support: Success

ABSTRACT

This case study of successful fund raising by a Seattle community coalition is intended to provide information to other community groups as they develop fund raising efforts. The case study begins with a presentation of information gleaned from a review of past newsletters and financial statements of the Southeast Effective Development (S.E.E.D.) community coalition. In this opening section, information is presented on the block grant funds which have been S.E.E.D.'s major source of financial support in the past, changes of focus throughout S.E.E.D.'s existence, and soliciting funds from private companies and agencies. In the next section, S.E.E.D.'s fund raising strategies are outlined. Topics discussed include designing and submitting proposals for funding, fund raising responsibilities, identifying concerns and goals of potential fund raising sources, searching for funds to support a particular program, and taking advantage of opportunities and community connections. The appendix which concludes the document presents a list of questions about the various grants and donations mentioned in S.E.E.D.'s newsletters and financial statements, fund raising strategies and policies, and S.E.E.D.'s major sources of financial support. The appendix also includes a 1976-1977 annual report of S.E.E.D., a 1978 financial statement, and notes to the financial statement. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205436

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Juanita F. Bowe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Fundraising Strategies For Community Organizations to Support Major Activities: A Case Study of Southeast Effective Development (S.E.E.D.)

by Julie Burr
Community Information Specialist

1979

SO 013 510

A community information project funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Library Research and Demonstration and coordinated by the Community Resource Center at Seattle University's Institute of Public Service and the Seattle Public Library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Study Approach	2
Introduction	4
Part I: S.E.E.D.'s Major Funding Sources	5
Part II: S.E.E.D.'s Fundraising Strategies	8
Appendix I: Study Questionnaire	
Appendix II: S.E.E.D.'s 1976-1977 Annual Report	
Appendix III: S.E.E.D.'s Financial Statements, June 30, 1978	

PREFACE

This is a case study of how the Southeast Effective Development (S.E.E.D.) community coalition has pursued and received funds to support the organization's community planning and betterment activities. It is one of five case studies being prepared as part of a federally funded project to establish a system for providing useful information to community groups. It is hoped that the documentation of the actual experiences of some community groups in the form of case studies can serve as guides for other groups pursuing similar activities and therefore contribute to their effectiveness.

This study does not cover the "how-to's" of funding searches or putting together proposals. For that information, the Seattle Public Library's Education Department is an excellent resource. The Library has the current Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, the "bible" of federal funding, as well as information on state monies and private foundations and offers computerized searches for funding sources by topic area. The Library also provides a videotape on use of the grants materials.

This study describes the funds received by a coalition of community organizations in the Southeast Seattle area and the fundraising strategies employed by coalition members as explained by the Executive Director of the coalition, Mr. Scott Kirkpatrick and the chairman of the Representative and Executive Councils, Mr. Ronald Sims.

STUDY APPROACH

Project staff, with suggestions from the project's advisory committee, decided that a case study of a community organization which has pursued and received major funds to support its activities is a logical complement to a prior study of community organization fundraising on a neighborhood level called "Fundraising For Neighborhood Groups: What Works in the Seattle Area", by Julie Burr, 1979. (This study is available in the Neighborhood Resource Center section of all Seattle Public Library branches.) The South East Effective Development (S.E.E.D.) community group coalition was selected because it is an organization well known to other community groups in the Seattle area and because of its successful history at securing major funds.

I began the case study by reviewing past newsletters and financial statements (see Appendices II and III) included in the Community Resource Center's (CRC) file on S.E.E.D. (The CRC is a component of the Institute of Public Service at Seattle University and maintains files of information on approximately 200 community councils and clubs in the Seattle area.) Next I compiled a list of questions about the various grants and donations mentioned in the newsletter and financial statements and included them, along with questions about fundraising strategies and policies in a questionnaire to be administered to persons closely associated with S.E.E.D.'s fundraising endeavors (see Appendix I.) I then interviewed Mr. Scott Kirkpatrick, Executive Director of S.E.E.D., and Mr. Ronald Sims, Chairperson of the coalition.

Mr. Kirkpatrick was selected to represent S.E.E.D. because he has been Executive Director of the organization since its inception, has been a key actor in securing funds for the agency, and oversees and coordinates all funding proposals from S.E.E.D.'s project managers. Mr. Sims is Chairman of the Executive and Representative Councils of S.E.E.D. and so represents the Southeast Seattle community as well as S.E.E.D.'s board.

The information obtained from Kirkpatrick and Sims has been organized into two parts. The first part describes the organization's major sources of financial support and the second part covers S.E.E.D.'s fundraising strategies as related by Kirpatrick and Sims.

INTRODUCTION

SOUTHEAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT (S.E.E.D.)

The Southeast Effective Development (S.E.E.D.) community group coalition was founded by six long time Southeast Seattle residents in 1975. The organizaiton was established as a planning and development agency for the approximately 72,000 residents of the Southeast area of Seattle. The area is very diverse both economically and racially. Thirty-four community groups in Southeast Seattle have joined the Southeast Effective Development coalition, representing the area from the I-90 Corridor on the North to the Seattle city limits on the South and from Lake Washington on the East to I-5 on the West. S.E.E.D. has promoted many self help programs and has sponsored a number of social services for residents in the areas of employment, housing, arts and health care. The organization has also taken an active role in securing funds for physical improvements for Southeast Seattle and administering the funds for the development of parks and playgrounds, street improvements and transportation planning. S.E.E.D. has been highly successful at securing major funds to support these programs and improvements. Following is a case study of S.E.E.D.'s fundraising endeavors.

PART I: S.E.E.D.'s Major Funding Sources

Block Grant

Seattle's Community Development Block Grant Program has been S.E.E.D.'s major funding source with 4.5 million dollars of Block Grant monies adminsitered through S.E.E.D. since 1975. S.E.E.D. first received one million dollars in Block Grant funds in 1975 and an additional 3.5 million dollars over the next few years for improvement programs in the Southeast Seattle area. Scott Kirkpatrick, S.E.E.D.'s Director, explained that most of these funds have actually gone in to the community for improvements with less than 10 percent going to S.E.E.D. to cover administrative costs. Ronald Sims, Chairperson of S.E.E.D., feels that no particular individual is entirely responsible for S.E.E.D.'s success in securing Block Grant funds. He explained that different elements of S.E.E.D.'s Block Grant proposals are written by the different project managers of each element and then the proposal is submitted as one package. He feels that the positive relationship between some of S.E.E.D.'s board members and staff and a few of the City Council members is the major factor in S.E.E.D.'s success at securing Block Grant funds.

Although Block Grant funds have been S.E.E.D.'s major source of financial support in the past, both Sims and Kirkpatrick state that S.E.E.D. may no longer pursue and administer Block Grant funds in the future. Staff of Seattle's Little City Halls have recently been asked to help leaders of community organizations write Block Grant proposals and S.E.E.D. does not want to duplicate this service for Southeast Seattle neighborhoods. Additionally,

Kirkpatrick has felt some Block Grant funded projects are inefficient and wasteful. Becuase of the slowness of such city departments as Parks and Engineering at implementing projects, the value of funds have diminished at a rate of 18% per year due to inflation. Another problem with Block Grant funds, according to Sims, is that they are controlled by the City and the City is constantly involved in policy disputes, changes its policies overnight and is unpredictable. S.E.E.D. is, in the future, interested in pursuing funds from the Federal Government's department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and bypassing the City altogether. Since the department of HUD is interested in funding "help yourself" activities rather than research and administration, S.E.E.D. may be changing its focus if funded by HUD to implementing such "help yourself" activities. Kirkpatrick explained that "help yourself" activities are meant to encourage economic mechanisms which allow a person or organization to do something more cheaply and efficiently than government.

Comprehensive Employment Training Act (C.E.T.A.)

Another major source of funds for S.E.E.D. has been the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) program. Since 1975 S.E.E.D. has received funds to hire over ten CETA staff for special projects under Title VI B and for several other CETA positions under Title II. Kirkpatrick related that S.E.E.D. has had difficulties hiring and retaining quality workers under the CETA program because, he feels, the CETA guidelines have gotten too strict and require that entry level CETA staff have very little previous job training or college level education. His experience has been that people hired to fill entry level CETA positions

aren't serious about their work and don't always contribute as much as they could towards reaching the organization's goals.

Other Sources of Financial Support

S.E.E.D. has received money from the Seattle/King County Health Department (over $2,000) for research and planning for the health care needs of Southeast Seattle residents. Providence Hospital, located in the Southeast Seattle community, also contributed funds ($2,500) to this project.

S.E.E.D. has also received a contract for over $500.00 from the Seattle Housing Authority to provide citizen participation monitoring and reporting for a Greenwood Gardens Study and over $700.00 from the Seattle Urban League for "on-the-job" training.

The organization also received a grant from the Washington State Arts Commission ($1,500), from the Seattle Arts Commission ($1,250) and from local businesses ($2,500) for development of community art programs and a permanent art committee in the Southeast Seattle area. In addition, there have been a considerable amount of in-kind contributions to the program from performers and volunteer workers. S.E.E.D. has been awarded $8,400 from United Way and $1,600 from the Medina Foundation for a study to determine if a youth employment program, which has been successful in the city of Portland, is feasible for implementation in the Seattle area. If the study determines the program to be feasible, further funds will be solicited for program implementation.

Although S.E.E.D. does not solicit donations from individual community members, the organization receives many unsolicited checks from the community with a note attached explaining that the doner would rather give to S.E.E.D. than United Way or some

other agencies.

S.E.E.D. does not hesitate to solicit donations from private companies and agencies, and because of S.E.E.D.'s growing credibility, many of these donations have become regular - S.E.E.D. has been written into their budget. According to Kirkpatrick, 98% of the companies S.E.E.D. once solicited for donations can now be counted on for yearly contributions - all S.E.E.D. has to do is write a letter requesting the funds.

PART II: S.E.E.D.'s Fundraising Strategies

Fundraising Responsibilites

Kirkpatrick explained that there is no single member of the S.E.E.D. staff who is responsible for writing grants, submitting proposals or soliciting donations. S.E.E.D. tried appointing a financial director for that purpose, but found that the various program managers could put together their ideas and package their proposals for funding much more efficiently and effectively than a financial director who was not as familiar with the various programs. Program managers are encouraged to develop their ideas and proposals for program funding and submit them to Kirkpatrick who coordinates the various proposals.

Sims explained that when soliciting public funds such as Block Grant or CETA funding, program managers submit different elements of a proposal according to their speciality, the different elements are put together and the proposal is submitted as one package.

When soliciting funds from a private foundation, a proposal is written by a staff member and submitted to S.E.E.D.'s board

for review. Upon approval of the proposal, the board refers to a list of potential contributors developed by board and staff members and prioritizes those that would be most appropriate to solicit for funds to support the proposal. One S.E.E.D. staff member and one board member then schedule an appointment with a representative of that potential funding source and begin the solicitation process. Sims explained that the list of potential contributers compiled by S.E.E.D. board and staff members prevents over utilization of one particular funding source. Additionally, new funding sources are added to the list as S.E.E.D. acquires new board and staff members who have new funding ideas and contacts for potential funding sources.

Sims firmly believes that successful fundraising depends largely on the strength of a community organization's board. Realizing this, S.E.E.D. is changing the make-up of its board to include people from lending and educational institutions as well as representatives of the community. Such persons can help secure funding for the organization because of their contacts, insights of potential funding sources and ability to set up meetings and get the solicitation process started. Sims believes much of S.E.E.D.'s success at fundraising is due to its board members "knowing someone."

Sims also feels that successful fundraising depends on backing and letting the funding source know who supports your proposal. Its important, he feels, to say who's involved and where they're from so that the proposal carries weight and credibility. When soliciting money from a business, for example, it would be very advantageous to say "our Chamber of Commerce is in favor of this

proposal." Such support can be gained through personal contact with a member of an organization or a well known and respected individual during a luncheon or over cocktails. Lending support needn't take a lot of a person's time or energy. A letter, attendance at a meeting or two or simply use of a name is usually sufficient.

Both Sims and Kirkpatrick feel that it is extremely important to understand the concerns and goals of the funding source before submitting your proposal to them. Knowing these concerns and goals, you then need to show how financial support of your proposal will help them achieve their goals or satisfy their concerns. They may be interested in funding a project that will produce a product, they may want their business advertised as a sponsor of a project or they may want representation on the project's steering committee. You need to understand the goals and concerns of the funding source in order to know how to convince them that supporting your proposal will be beneficial to them. As Sims puts it, "You need to do more than just move their hearts with your proposal, you need to show them what they will get out of it." You need to obtain this information before submitting your proposal or meeting with a representative of the funding source, either through a board member who works for the organization or through another contact person. As an example, before a meeting with a representative from Pacific National Bank to discuss funding for a S.E.E.D. proposal, S.E.E.D. members found out that Pacific National Bank was not really concerned with the monetary amount of a proposal or with the substance of the proposal as much as they were concerned about giving money to an organization that had a good reputation and was well known.

Learning this, S.E.E.D. put together and presented PNB with a booklet of favorable write-ups and press releases about their organization, which was exactly what PNB was interested in seeing before funding their proposal.

A further fundraising strategy used by S.E.E.D., as explained by Kirkpatrick, is to get the commitments of several funding sources to support one project. As an example, in soliciting funds from a business, a member of S.E.E.D. will ask for $ 2,000 on the condition that $ 2,000 is also secured from another business to support the same project. S.E.E.D. members believe that businesses feel more comfortable donating money to a project if they know they're not alone in the venture. It is the same strategy as a joint venture and your're simply putting up someone else's collateral.

Funding Sources

When researching funding sources S.E.E.D. uses two approaches: 1) seeing what funds are available for what types of projects and then tailoring a proposal to meet those funding requirements and 2) having a specific program in mind and searching for funds to support that particular program. Kirkpatrick feels the first type of funding search is important to insure the continued operation of the organization that is dependant of funding through grants and donations. For example, S.E.E.D. is interested in pursuing funding from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). To do so, S.E.E.D. will need to change its focus from research and planning to a more active program demonstration role because that is what HUD is interested in funding.

On the other hand, Kirkpatrick feels the second kind of funding search to be equally as important to prevent the solicitation of funds for the sole purpose of continued operation, without really having control over the goals and objectives of the organization itself.

Mr. Kirpatrick believes community organizations need a strategy for their future in order to recognize and take advantage of opportunities and connections. For example, a business may not be interested in contributing to a current project, but is interested when you explain your plans for a future project that more closely corresponds with the goals of the business. Or, an agency may agree to fund a second or third phase of a project rather than the first phase or entire project. A group that knows where it is headed can make notes of everyday contacts that may prove to be valuable resources in the future.

Kirkpatrick warns against accepting money from a source that places too many restrictions and requirements on the use of that money. He has seen organizations having to sacrifice their goals and objectives in order to satisfy the requirements of the funding source. He advises a thorough understanding of the terms of the agreement before accepting funds of any kind.

APPENDIX I

Questionnaire for the Case Study

of S.E.E.D.'s Fundraising Strategies

1) Below are some funding sources mentioned in past issues of the SEED newsletter which have supported various activities of SEED. Please varify each funding source and add comments and explanations to clarify the activities the various funds supported (staff, physical improvements, products, etc.) the approximate date the funds were awarded, the amount and duration of the funds.

a) Over $4.5 million dollars in Block Grant funds since 1975.

b) A contract with the city to develop a Southeast area plan for Seattle.

c) $20,000 City CETA Grant for Health Survey plus $2,500 from Providence Hospital for the survey.

d) A grant from the Seattle Arts Commission to develop a method for organizing a permanent S.E. Seattle Arts Committee.

e) An award of $8,400 from United Way as partial funding for developing an innovative youth employment program with additional funds being sought from the Medina Foundation and 1979 Block Grant funds.

2) Please list other major funds awarded to SEED including the funding source, amount and date of award and for what purpose the funds are awarded.

Source	Amount	Date	Purpose

3) How do you get funding for your basic operating expenses (offices, phones, etc.)?

Please describe the following:

4) Grants received by SEED which required a "matching contribution".

5) Large donations (e.g. office space, equipment, supplies) that SEED has received or is currently receiving?

6) SEED's use of volunteers?

7) SEED's membership drive, request for contributions.

8) Any "grassroots" fundraising activities SEED has been involved with.

To help me analyze SEED's success in securing major funds to support its activities, please answer the following questions:

9) Why do you think SEED has been successful in obtaining grants?

10) Does SEED have a financial director/s? If so, please describe this person/s experience and qualifications.

11) Who actually writes SEED's grant proposals?

12) To what degree is citizen participation recruited during the grant writing process?

13) How does SEED determine which funding sources to solicit?

14) Does SEED usually have a program in mind and then solicit funds or design programs in the areas where funds are available?

15) Does SEED continue to solicit the same funding sources after having been funded once by an organization?

16) What differences have you found between private and public funding sources for neighborhood improvement activities?

17) Do you feel that coalitions of neighborhood groups have a better chance of receiving neighborhood improvement funds than individual neighborhood groups?

18) Did SEED have a more difficult time securing funding in its early stages than at present?

19) Do you feel that groups who take stances on controversial issues have a harder time soliciting funds?

20) What part does politics play for community groups seeking funds?

21) What do you suggest doing in addition to following the guidelines of an RFP or the formal Block Grant process in order to secure a grant?

22) What grants has SEED applied for that have been turned down and what do you think are the reasons for rejection?

23) Would you say that SEED has a fundraising strategy? If so, please explain.

24) What advise would you give to neighborhood group leaders seeking major funds to support their activities?

APPENDIX II

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT, Inc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4920 Rainier Avenue South
Seattle, Washington 98118
(206) 723-7333/722-3213

1976-77 Annual Report

June 30, 1977

Early in 1974, six longtime community residents and businessmen began meeting weekly to explore opportunities for improving Southeast Seattle. The group agreed that unification and coordination were necessary if any kind of planned community development was to be achieved. Through the efforts of this early steering committee, South East Effective Development was formed in January 1975.

Thirty-seven community groups became members and a policy-making body called the Representative Council was organized with two representatives from each of these groups. Several standing committees, such as social services, transportation, and parks and recreation evolved out of special areas of concern to SEED and the community. Committee membership was broad and not limited to Council representatives. An Executive Committee was formed and special ad hoc committees have been organized to address specific issues.

The same year, SEED requested that the Seattle City Council set aside money for community improvement projects from the City's Federal Community Development Block Grant funds. With City Council approval $1 million was reserved for capital improvement projects in Southeast Seattle to be chosen through a community participation process directed by SEED.

The community organization conducted two series of residential and business-related workshops and a telephone survey to find out what Southeast residents and business people believed were the most pressing problems in the community. SEED's staff prepared an Expenditure Plan for capital improvement projects suggested by the community and recommended 28 projects to the Representative Council in November, 1976.

The City Council held public hearings on SEED's proposed Expenditure Plan and approved by resolution the process and recommended projects before the Representative Council's final vote. On April 20, 1977 the SEED Council chose by ballot 15 projects to be funded The other 13 projects were submitted to the City as "unfunded priority projects" for 1978 funding consideration.

Prior to the April meeting, SEED members had selected seven Southeast Seattle public service programs for funding from $50,000 of Block Grant funds for community "critical needs" and committed $86,700 of the $1 million to urgent Southeast programs and projects in January, 1977. The City's Executive Department reviewed, and the City Council approved these funding allocations early in 1977.

The April 20 meeting was the culmination of two years of extensive participation by over 1,000 Southeast residents, business persons and community groups in determining how tax dollars would be spent for physical development in Southeast Seattle.

Joseph Jerry Banchero

Joseph Jerry Banchero
Chairperson

Southeast Seattle Community Development Expenditure Plan/1977

Planning Boundaries
North, I-90; East, Lake Washington; South, Seattle City Limits; West, I-5

Public Services

Rainier Beach Pool, to keep it open an additional day during the school year. $10,340

Neighborhood Health Centers, to expand its program for information to elderly about available medical services. $3,000

Southeast Youth Accountability and Service Bureau, to purchase recreational equipment to be used by youth in the neighborhood crime reduction program. $1,860

Holly Park Neighborhood House, to assist the Samoan and Polynesian populations of Southeast Seattle obtain emergency aid and other services. $7,180

Parks and Recreation/Public Services Flyer, for production and delivery of a flyer to Southeast residents. $2,620

Minor Home Repair, to purchase services of specialists to do minor home repair for senior citizens in the Columbia, Columbia Heights, and Hillman City area. $25,000

Community Improvements

Kubota Gardens Master Plan, to design an acquisition and master plan for the preservation of the culturally significant Japanese-American gardens. $5,000

Beacon and S. Columbian Way Median Improvements, boulevard improvements extending from S. Alaska St. to S. Ferdinand St. along Beacon (approx. 1200 ft.) with pedestrian pathways, parking, widening and paving of the avenues for two lanes each direction, and street and median trees. $191,000

Columbia City Business District Improvements, to provide for revitalization of the shopping district to be matched with $300,000 of Neighborhood Improvement Program funds. $100,000

Community Planning

Columbia City Business District Study, a matching share with the Columbia City Development Association and City's Department of Community Development to develop strategies for improving the physical and economic climate of the shopping district. $10,000

Southeast Housing Program Administration, to develop a housing rehabilitation program for the community. $25,000

Community Coordination and Project Management, for SEED, program administration. $28,000

Neighborhood Improvements

Self-Help Mini-Park/Playground Projects, the following sites are to be used: Emerson Elementary, Wing Luke Elementary, Brighton Elementary, Columbia Elementary, and El Centro de la Raza. $30,000

Sanitary Sewer Improvements, A Subsidy to Low Income Elderly, to subsidize low income elderly in the 33rd Ave. S. and 55th Ave. S. LID's sanitary sewer project. $10,000

Horton Hill Park, for self-help mini-park. $16,700

Sidewalk Construction on: Sturtevant Ave. S.; S. Dawson St. between 28th and 30th Ave. S. (north-side); 29th Ave. S. between S. Brandon and S. Hudson Streets. $30,000

Empire Way S. and S. Kenyon St. Arterial Pedestrian Signal, a pedestrian activated stop signal for crossing Empire Way S. $80,000

Four Triangle Improvements, sidewalk, curb, and landscaping improvements at Rainier Ave. S. and S. Graham Streets; Rainier Ave. S. and S. Rose Streets; S. Edmonds and 32nd Ave.S.; 15th Ave. S. and Beacon Ave. S. $25,000

39th Avenue South and South Othello Street a pedestrian activated stop signal for crossing Othello Street. $45,000

S. Director Street, an allocation to relieve storm drainage problems. $2,000

Neighborhood Facilities

Children and Youth Clinic at Columbia Health Center, remodeling and expansion to add three rooms, construction of an x-ray room and purchase of an x-ray machine. $74,000

Hutchinson Shelter House Rehabilitation, reconstruction of fire damaged structure which serves as a neighborhood recreation facility. $22,000

El Centro de la Raza Neighborhood Center Improvement, rehabilitation of existing structure at "Old Beacon Hill" including new roof, new heating system with insulation, storm windows, weatherstripping, etc.. $183,000

Holly Park Medical Clinic, relocation and remodeling costs adding exam rooms and staff work space; double the amount of their current space to deal with an increased patient load. $14,000

Southeast Seattle Dental Clinic, relocation and remodeling cost with six dental operatories for adult and elderly dental care; the group currently shares the use of three chairs with the Children and Youth Clinic. $55,000

Highlights of Committee and Community Participation

Transportation

SEED's Transportation Committee has established important links with Metro Transit in affecting a public participation process for Southeast Seattle citizens to respond to and to direct changes in the transit system.

The first victory for the community was in amending Metro's proposed changes to cut service from the No. 39 Seward Park route. The committee was able to get Metro to extend service to Columbia City rather than the original proposed off-peak hour terminus at Genesee Street. Most recently, the committee initiated a community meeting with Metro Staff and City Council's Transportation Committee to discuss transit alternatives for #7 Rainier route.

Parks and Recreation

An evaluation of Southeast Seattle park and recreation capital improvement needs will soon be completed by SEED's Parks and Recreation Committee and staff.

Last fall and winter, two community surveys were conducted to prioritize community park development needs. The survey information resulted in the submission of 14 proposals to the City's Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program for 1978-83.

Projects funded in the Southeast Seattle Expenditure Plan are: the Kubota Gardens Feasibility and Master Plan which is scheduled to begin in July, 1977; the rehabilitation of the Hutchinson Shelter House; and five self-help mini-park-playground projects on school sites throughout the community. Of the two present mini-park projects, the Whitworth Neighborhood Recreation Area has been completed and construction has begun on the Graham Hill project.

Social Services

The Social Services Committee formed to address citizen concerns about the lack of specific services in the Southeast area and the need to continue funding services cut from the City's budget.

A program analysis of Block Grant funded social services has been completed. That analysis is being matched with data on all social services in Southeast Seattle to avoid overlap of services and to continue an assessment of the social, health, education, and employment services needed in the community.

The sharing of information and concerns continues around issues such as an Employment Security Office relocating in our area and the effect that has on employment and environmental concerns in Southeast Seattle; a forum for community advocate agencies to learn how to assist the Department of Social and Health Services in doing client intake paperwork; involvement in a centralized transportation pilot program for the elderly and handicapped.

New Program Directions

Economic Development

SEED is aware of the importance of and need for business improvement in Southeast Seattle. To this end, the Representative Council voted $10,000 to a business district improvement study for Columbia City. These Block Grant funds will match other funds contributed by the Columbia City Development Association and the Department of Community Development. An additional $100,000 was prioritized in April for Columbia City improvements to make the business district more competitive and attractive.

Presently, the SEED staff is conducting a survey of commerical/industrial development potential. The University of Washington School of Business Administration is assisting SEED with the data collection and analysis. An additional retail/commercial analysis and program development will begin this summer and will be coordinated with the City's Office of Economic Development.

SEED's primary goal in economic development is to provide support and information for the existing and potential Southeast business community and to encourage better employment opportunities for community residents.

Housing

SEED staff is currently designing a program to assist homeowners and neighborhood groups to improve community housing conditions. The staff plans to work closely with the City's Office of Housing Development (OHD) to streamline its housing rehabilitation program for eligible homeowners in Southeast Seattle. SEED will be assisting OHD to market individual home loans in Southeast neighborhoods and will undertake analysis of land use, housing conditions, and ownership. In addition, private sector participation is being sought to improve public awareness of available traditional home loan programs and other applicable financial assistance.

SEED's Future

For the past two years, SEED has concentrated its efforts on identifying the specific physical development needs of the community. With initial capital improvement projects funded, it is now time to focus attention on public policies and private initiatives that influence social services and economic planning as well as further physical development in Southeast Seattle

It is SEED's intent to encourage participation from the private sector both in in-kind services and through financial contributions. A fund raising campaign has been initiated with a goal of $50,000. To date, SEED has received $6,660 in private donations.

SEED continues to be a convener for community representatives in addressing pertinent Southeast issues, in gathering information and in making this information available to public officials for decision-making purposes. In the past, this process has proven effective in achieving City Council recognition of Southeast Seattle's needs. The future holds many opportunities for working closely with the City, the private sector and governmental agencies to achieve needed improvements for Southeast Seattle.

Representative Council

Columbia City Development Association
Columbia City Merchants Association
Columbia Heights Improvement Association
Dearborn Park Planning Committee
El Centro de la Raza
Emerson PTA
Graham Hill PTA
Greater Rainier Beach Community Council
Holly Park Community Council
Holly Park Medical Clinic
Lee House Senior Center
Mt. Baker Community Club
Mt. Baker Housing Rehabilitation Program
Mt. Baker Park United Presbyterian Church
Our Lady of Mt. Virgin Church
Neighborhood House
Rainier Beach Community Club
Rainier Beach United Methodist Church
Rainier Beach Women's Club
Rainier Chamber of Commerce
Rainier Community Action Center
Rainier Kiwanis
Rainier Lions Club
Rainier Outreach and Crisis Services
Rainier Vista Community Council
Southeast Education Committee
Southeast Seattle Health Committee
Southeast Seattle Community Dental Clinic
St. Paul Church
St. Vincent De Paul
Whitworth PTA
Wing Luke PTA

Executive Committee 1976-77

Chairperson, Jerry Banchero
Vice Chairperson, Mike Lamb
Secretary, Larry Silverman
Treasurer, Stu Weiss

Committee Chairpeople 1976-77

Hilda Lahore,	Transportation
Chris Woodall	Social Services
Harry Wong	Education and Employment
Norman Rice	Housing
Brook Stanford	Parks and Recreation

SEED Staff

Scott Kirkpatrick	Executive Director
Jan Furey	Economic Development Coordinator
Deniel Banks	Community Information Coordinator
James Hanson	Physical Planner
Cathy Miller	Social Service Coordinator
Raphael Murrell	Administrative Assistant

South East Effective Development, Inc.
4920 Rainier Avenue South
Seattle, Washington 98118

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit #3355
Seattle, WA

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

(A Nonprofit Corporation)

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

JUNE 30, 1978

ROBERT L. McCORKLE

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT
EVERGREEN BUILDING/SUITE 521
155. GRADY WAY
RENTON, WASHINGTON 98055
(206)228-6133

To the Board of Directors
South East Effective Development

I have examined the balance sheet of South East Effective Development at June 30, 1978 and the related statements of revenue, expenditures and net worth and changes in financial position for the year then ended. My examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as I considered necessary in the circumstances.

The financial statements of South East Effective Development as of June 30, 1977 were not audited by me and, accordingly, I do not express an opinion on this.

In my opinion, the aforementioned financial statements present fairly the financial position of South East Effective Development at June 30, 1978 and the results of its operations and changes in its financial position for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles consistently applied.

ROBERT L. McCORKLE

September 21, 1978

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
BALANCE SHEET

	JUNE 30, 1978	JUNE 30, 1977 (Unaudited)
ASSETS		
CURRENT ASSETS:		
Petty cash on hand	$ 20	$ -
Cash in banks	4,748	4,464
Receivables	8,974	19,528
Prepaid rent	600	-
Total current assets	$ 14,342	$ 23,992
EQUIPMENT - at cost	$ 2,607	$ -
Less accumulated depreciation	147	-
	$ 2,460	$ -
DEPOSITS - Washington Natural Gas	$ 60	$ 60
	$ 16,862	$ 24,052
LIABILITIES AND NET WORTH		
CURRENT LIABILITIES:		
Notes payable - Seattle-First National Bank	$ 8,774	$ 17,112
Accounts payable	3,605	4,144
Payroll taxes payable	1,330	504
Accrued interest payable	-	125
Current portion of long-term debt	876	-
Total current liabilities	$ 14,585	$ 21,885
LONG-TERM LIABILITIES:		
Equipment contracts, payable in monthly payments of $77	$ 1,756	$ -
Less current portion included above	876	-
	$ 880	$ -
NET WORTH	$ 1,397	$ 2,167
	$ 16,862	$ 24,052

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
STATEMENT OF REVENUE, EXPENDITURES AND NET WORTH

	YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1978	1977 (Unaudited)
REVENUE:		
Contracts (Note 2)	$ 96,987	$ 79,935
Grants (Note 2)	2,500	5,201
Contributions	3,855	2,271
Memberships	310	505
Donated goods, space and volunteer services (Note 3)	20,558	-
	$124,210	$ 87,912
EXPENDITURES:		
Wages	$ 81,983	$ 56,102
Donated services (Note 3)	19,119	-
Payroll taxes	1,996	1,560
Accounting	668	169
Consulting services subcontracted	5,082	5,015
Depreciation	147	-
Equipment rent	4,100	95
Insurance	369	362
Interest and bank charges	1,510	522
Mini-park expenses (Note 4)	28,731	10,955
Miscellaneous	83	-
Office supplies and expenses	3,007	6,884
Postage	1,567	703
Printing	894	1,753
Rent expenses paid	2,775	1,500
Rent space donated (Note 3)	1,164	-
Repairs and maintenance	366	133
Southeast Summer Arts Festival expenses (Note 5)	2,586	-
Telephone	2,245	1,755
Travel and training	483	685
Utilities	449	387
	$159,324	$ 88,580
Less reimbursements of wages and payroll taxes by Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) and College Workstudy Program	34,344	416
	$124,980	$ 88,164
EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUE	$ (770)	$ (252)
FUND BALANCE, Beginning of Year	2,167	2,419
FUND BALANCE, End of Year	$ 1,397	$ 2,167

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FINANCIAL POSITION

	YEARS ENDED JUNE 30,	
	1978	1977 (Unaudited)
FINANCIAL RESOURCES WERE PROVIDED BY:		
Operations:		
Excess of expenditures over revenue	$ (770)	$ (252)
Add charges to operations for depreciation not requiring use of working capital	147	-
	$ (623)	$ (252)
Long-term financing	1,756	-
	$ 1,133	$ (252)
FINANCIAL RESOURCES WERE APPLIED TO:		
Acquisition of equipment	$ 2,607	$ -
Reclassification of long-term debt to current portion	876	-
	$ 3,483	$ -
(DECREASE) IN WORKING CAPITAL	$ (2,350)	$ (252)
CHANGES IN WORKING CAPITAL:		
Increase (decrease) in current assets:		
Cash	$ 304	$ 3,703
Receivables	(10,554)	3,481
Prepaid rent	600	-
	$ (9,650)	$ 7,184
Decrease (increase) in current liabilities:		
Notes payable	$ 8,338	$(17,112)
Accounts payable	539	10,200
Payroll taxes payable	(826)	(399)
Accrued interest payable	125	(125)
Current portion of long-term debt	(876)	-
	$ 7,300	$ (7,436)
(DECREASE) IN WORKING CAPITAL	$ (2,350)	$ (252)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - JUNE 30, 1978

NOTE 1 - SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

(a) Basis of Accounting - The Corporation maintains its records on the accrual method of accounting.

(b) Depreciation Policy - The cost of equipment is depreciated on the straight-line method over an estimated useful life of three years.

(c) Federal Income Taxes - South East Effective Development is an organization exempt from Federal taxes on income.

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - JUNE 30, 1978 (CONTINUED)

NOTE 2 - CONTRACTS AND GRANTS:

Contracts and grants which were in progress during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1978 and 1977 are summarized below:

	Year Ended June 30, 1978	Year Ended June 30, 1977
Contracts:		
Department of Community Development - Community Development Block Grant (Southeast Seattle Community Development Project)	$ 60,849	$ 68,232
Department of Community Development - Community Development Block Grants (Southeast Seattle Neighborhood Self-Help Recreation Areas)	33,920	11,135
Seattle/King County Health Department (Southeast Seattle Health Planning Study)	2,218	-
Seattle Housing Authority (Citizen Participation Monitoring and Report for Greenwood Gardens Study)	-	568
Seattle Urban League (On-the-Job Training)	-	701
Total Contracts	$ 96,987	$ 80,636
Grants:		
Weyerhaeuser Company Foundation (Southeast Seattle Human Resource Development Program)	$ 2,500	$ -
Medina Foundation (Southeast Seattle Human Resource Development Program)	-	4,500
Total Grants	$ 2,500	$ 4,500
TOTAL CONTRACTS AND GRANTS	$ 99,487	$ 85,136

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - JUNE 30, 1978 (CONTINUED)

NOTE 3 - DONATED GOODS AND VOLUNTEER SERVICES:

In accordance with recommendations of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Corporation has included the value of donated goods and volunteer services as part of total revenue and total expenses.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1978, the following donated goods and volunteer services were received by the Corporation:

Volunteer services	$ 19,119
Donated space for meetings	1,164
Donated value of equipment rentals for mini-parks program	275
	$ 20,558

NOTE 4 - MINI-PARKS EXPENSES:

Beginning in 1977 and continuing through 1978 the Corporation has coordinated the planning and construction of neighborhood play areas in Southeast Seattle. Direct expenses of the mini-parks program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1978 consist of:

Materials	$ 26,306
Subcontractors	519
Equipment rentals	1,294
Miscellaneous	17
Permits	95
Repairs and maintenance	500
	$ 28,731

SOUTH EAST EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT
(A Nonprofit Corporation)
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS - JUNE 30, 1978 (CONTINUED)

NOTE 5 - SOUTHEAST SEATTLE SUMMER ARTS FESTIVAL EXPENSES:

In the summer of 1978 the Corporation sponsored the Southeast Summer Arts Festival, a series of arts programs for Southeast residents including crafts, dance, theatre, music and children's programs. Expenses for this project for the period ended June 30, 1978 included equipment rental, printing, advertising, security, and supplies.